

REMARKS

The Office Action has been carefully reviewed. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims in light of the foregoing amendments is respectfully requested.

A petition and fee for a three-month extension of time is submitted separately. An information disclosure statement and fee also accompanies this response.

Claims 1, 2-6, 10-13, 15 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Qui et al. (U.S. Published Patent Application 2004/0018295) in view of Honig et al. (U.S. Published Patent Application 2003/0026898). The Office Action stated that Qui et al. disclose a method of forming a multilayer thin film heterostructure in which one or more layers of polyanionic and polycationic polymer layers are spin coated onto a substrate. Following the deposition of one ionic polymer, the coated substrate material is dried before the deposition of the next ionic polymer layer having opposite charges. Whereas Qui et al. disclose spin coating the ionic polymer layers onto the substrate, Qui et al. do not specifically disclose that the substrate is spinning during this application step. Hong et al. disclose a method of forming ultrathin multilayer films in which the substrate is spinning during application of an organic layer. Since the method of Hong et al. permits formation of ultrathin organic layers, the Office Action concluded that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that the spin coating method of Hong et al. in which the substrate is spinning could be used in the known method of Qui et al., since the spin coating technique of Hong et al. allows precise control over the thickness of the deposited layers.

Claims 1-5 have been cancelled by this amendment. Claims 6 and 10-13 have been amended to change the dependency onto an allowable claim. Claim 15 is now dependent upon a claim that is dependent upon an allowable claim, while claim 17 was originally dependent upon an objected to claim and is believed to now been allowable.

Claims 7-9, 14 and 16 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 7-9, 14 and 16 have each been re-written in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In addition, claims 6, 10, 11, 12 and 13 have been amended to be dependent upon either newly independent claim 7 or claim 8. Also, a new claim 18 dependent upon newly independent claim 9 has been added. Original claim 17 was dependent upon newly independent claim 16, while original claim 15 was dependent upon claim 6, which has been amended to be dependent upon newly independent claim 8. Accordingly, these claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, claims 6-18 are urged to be allowable over 35 U.S.C. 103. If the Examiner believes there are any unresolved issues despite this amendment, the Examiner is urged to contact the applicants' attorney undersigned below for a telephonic interview to resolve any such issue. A favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

June 15, 2005

Bruce H. Cottrell

Signature of Attorney

Reg. No. 30,620
Phone (505) 667-9168

Bruce H. Cottrell
Los Alamos National Laboratory
LC/IP, MS A187
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545